ENGINEERING BY VIEWGRAPHS

The Debris Assessment Team presented its analysis in a formal briefing to the Mission Evaluation Room that relied on Power-Point slides from Boeing. When engineering analyses and risk assessments are condensed to fit on a standard form or overhead slide, information is inevitably lost. In the process, the priority assigned to information can be easily misrepresented by its placement on a chart and the language that is used. Dr. Edward Tufte of Yale University, an expert in information presentation who also researched communications failures in the *Challenger* accident, studied how the slides used by the Debris Assessment Team in their briefing to the Mission Evaluation Room misrepresented key information.³⁸

The slide created six levels of hierarchy, signified by the title and the symbols to the left of each line. These levels prioritized information that was already contained in 11 simple sentences. Tufte also notes that the title is confusing. "Review of Test Data Indicates Conservatism" refers not to the predicted tile damage, but to the choice of test models used to predict the damage.

Only at the bottom of the slide do engineers state a key piece of information: that one estimate of the debris that struck *Columbia* was 640 times larger than the data used to calibrate the model on which engineers based their damage assessments. (Later analysis showed that the debris object was actually 400 times larger). This difference led Tufte to suggest that a more appropriate headline would be "Review of Test Data Indicates Irrelevance of Two Models." ³⁹

Tufte also criticized the sloppy language on the slide. "The vaguely quantitative words 'significant' and 'significantly' are used 5 times on this slide," he notes, "with de facto meanings ranging from 'detectable in largely irrelevant calibration case study' to 'an amount of damage so that everyone dies' to 'a difference of 640-fold.' "40 Another example of sloppiness is that "cubic inches" is written inconsistently: "3cu. In," "1920cu in," and "3 cu in." While such inconsistencies might seem minor, in highly technical fields like aerospace engineering a misplaced decimal point or mistaken unit of measurement can easily engender inconsistencies and inaccuracies. In another phrase "Test results do show that it is possible at sufficient mass and velocity," the word "it" actually refers to "damage to the protective tiles."

As information gets passed up an organization hierarchy, from people who do analysis to mid-level managers to high-level leadership, key explanations and supporting information is filtered out. In this context, it is easy to understand how a senior manager might read this PowerPoint slide and not realize that it addresses a life-threatening situation.

At many points during its investigation, the Board was surprised to receive similar presentation slides from NASA officials in place of technical reports. The Board views the endemic use of PowerPoint briefing slides instead of technical papers as an illustration of the problematic methods of technical communication at NASA.

Review Of Test Data Indicates Conservatism for Tile
Penetration

The existing SOFI on tile test data used to create Crater was reviewed along with STS-107 Southwest Research data
Crater overpredicted penetration of tile coating
significantly
Initial penetration to described by normal velocity
Varies with volume/mass of projectile(e.g., 200ft/sec for 3cu. In)
Significant energy is required for the softer SOFI particle to penetrate the relatively hard tile coating
Test results do show that the possible at sufficient mass and velocity
Conversely, once tile is penetrated SOFI can cause significant damage
Minor variations in total energy (above penetration level) can cause significant tile damage
Flight condition is significantly outside of test database
Volume of ramp is 1920cu in vs 3 cu in for test

The vaguely quantitative words "significant" and "significantly" are used 5 times on this slide, with *de facto* meanings ranging from "detectable in largely irrelevant calibration case study" to "an amount of damage so that everyone dies" to "a difference of 640-fold." None of these 5 usages appears to refer to the technical meaning of "statistical significance."

The low resolution of PowerPoint slides promotes the use of compressed phrases like "Tile Penetration." As is the case here, such phrases may well be ambiquous. (The low resolution and large font generate 3 typographic orphans, lonely words dangling on a seperate line.)

This vague pronoun reference "it" alludes to damage to the protective tiles, which caused the destruction of the Columbia. The slide weakens important material with ambiquous language (sentence fragments, passive voice, multiple meanings of "significant"). The 3 reports were created by engineers for high-level NASA officials who were deciding whether the threat of wing damage required further investigation before the Columbia attempted return. The officials were satisfied that the reports indicated that the Columbia was not in danger, and no attempts to further examine the threat were made. The slides were part of an oral presentation and also were circulated as e-mail attachments.

(cubic inches) is shown a different way every time

3cu. in 1920cu. in 3 cu. in

rather than in clear and tidy exponential form 1920 in³.

Perhaps the available font cannot show exponents.

Shakiness in units of measurement provokes concern.

Slides that use hierarchical bullet-outlines here do not handle statistical data and scientific notation gracefully.

If PowerPoint is a corporate-mandated format for all engineering reports, then some competent scientific typography (rather than the PP market-pitch style) is essential. In this slide, the typography is so choppy and clunky that it impedes understanding.

In this slide the same unit of measure for volume

The analysis by Dr. Edward Tufte of the slide from the Debris Assessment Team briefing. [SOFI=Spray-On Foam Insulation]